

**AMENDMENT AND RESPONSE**

Applicant: Mark L. Yoseloff

Serial No.: 09/405,921

Filed September 24, 1999

Docket No.: 307.026US1 PA0368.ap.US

Examiner: S. Ashburn

Group Art Unit: 3713

Title: VIDEO GAMING APPARATUS FOR WAGERING WITHUNIVERSAL COMPUTERIZED CONTROLLER AND I/O INTERFACE FOR UNIQUE ARCHITECTURE

---

"A decision on the issue....of enablement required determination of whether a person skilled in the pertinent art, using the knowledge available to such a person and the disclosure in the patent document, could make and use the invention without undue experimentation. **It is not fatal if some experimentation is needed**, for the patent document is not intended to be a production specification." (*Emphasis added*).

The background of the art is that video gaming equipment is usually constructed by creating a single motherboard with all intelligence components embedded in the circuit board, and a pinning system is provided to connect the intelligence to the non-intelligence operations of the apparatus to operate those non-intelligent functions (e.g., change slot, video display, tilt identification, assistance light, etc.). Each and every component of the conventional system has already been in commerce for many years and each comprise well-known and conventional systems based upon commercially available sub-components. It is absolutely critical to note that the present invention does not require the invention of new fundamental hardware sub-components or fundamentally different software. To exemplify these facts, the following diagrams are believed to be useful:

**PRIOR ART MOTHERBOARD AND PIN SYSTEM****Complete Hardware System Covering:****Complete Game Rules****Complete Graphics System****Complete Security****Complete Coin Handling****Random Number Generator****Payout Tables****Power Outage Maintenance**

**AMENDMENT AND RESPONSE**

Applicant: Mark L. Yoseloff

Serial No.: 09/405,921

Filed September 24, 1999

Title: VIDEO GAMING APPARATUS FOR WAGERING WITHUNIVERSAL COMPUTERIZED CONTROLLER AND I/O INTERFACE FOR UNIQUE ARCHITECTURE

Docket No.: 307.026US1 PA0368.ap.US

Examiner: S. Ashburn

Group Art Unit: 3713

The pinning system is hand drawn on the right side of the motherboard representation.

In the practice of the present invention, one example of the system according to the present invention as claimed may be diagrammatically represented as shown below:

**TWO SEGMENT SYSTEM OF THE INVENTION****Partial Hardware System Covering:****Complete Game Rules****Random Number Generator****Payout Tables****Partial Hardware System Covering:****Complete Graphics System****Complete Coin Handling****Power Outage Maintenance****Complete Security**

As can be seen from the two segment system, the first segment would be added for each type of game or gaming system to be installed in the pre-existing apparatus. This would be added as a motherboard to the apparatus that already contained (or had previously installed therein) the second segment. The second segment contains what will be referred to as native intelligence, or intelligence that has a general utility in a number of games and formats, but does not contain intelligence or information that necessarily must be used with only a single game or single type of game (e.g., game rules, payout tables specific for a single game, etc.). The electrical connections from the first segment to the second segment merely provide ultimate access to the pinning system on the second segment. Note that the pinning system in the second architecture is identical to that in the first architecture so that the video gaming apparatus can be connected

**AMENDMENT AND RESPONSE**

Applicant: Mark L. Yoseloff

Serial No.: 09/405,921

Filed September 24, 1999

Title: VIDEO GAMING APPARATUS FOR WAGERING WITHUNIVERSAL COMPUTERIZED CONTROLLER AND I/O INTERFACE FOR UNIQUE ARCHITECTURE

Docket No.: 307.026US1 PA0368.ap.US

Examiner: S. Ashburn

Group Art Unit: 3713

properly, just as it was in the first architecture. When viewed in this perspective, absolutely no undue experimentation need be done in practice of the present invention. On a simplistic level, once the concept of the invention has been appreciated, it would even be theoretically possible to cut and paste the original motherboard and simply make additional electrical connections (as between the first and second segments) to practice the invention. The design may be improved, of course, by ordinary skill in the art, but to one of ordinary skill in the art, the practice of the invention, as broadly as claimed has been fully enabled. There are no new overall functions provided in the two separate systems, but the separation of the functions has surprisingly enabled a much easier platform on which games may be placed and designed. This design change has a much greater effect and benefit than would be expected by merely dividing the components. This design change goes against the complete history of game development, and introduces unexpected benefits in designing and engineering costs.

It is to be noted, that where a lack of enablement has been asserted, it is incumbent upon the Patent and Trademark Office to provide specific reasons why the device is not enabled. The mere assertion of a legal conclusion of lack of enablement is insufficient. Of particular note is the commentary of the CCPA in its decision in *In re Strahilevitz*, 212 U.S.P.Q. 561, 1982 C.C.P.A.:

“A threshold issue is whether the PTO met its burden of proof in calling into question the enablement of appellant’s disclosure. This burden required that the PTO advance acceptable reasoning inconsistent with enablement. Thereupon, the burden would shift to appellant...that one of ordinary skill in the art could have practiced the claimed invention without undue experimentation....We recognize that working examples are desirable in complex technologies and that detailed examples can satisfy the statutory enablement requirement...Nevertheless, ...examples are not required to satisfy section 112, first paragraph.”

As noted in the above discussion, not only has the PTO failed to provide specific reasoning directed towards the structure of the device that has not been enabled, but rather has made general remarks attacking lack of enablement solely on the basis that the device is new, but also Applicant has provided sound arguments directed towards the specific structure claimed that

AMENDMENT AND RESPONSE

Applicant: Mark L. Yoseloff

Serial No.: 09/405,921

Filed September 24, 1999

Title: VIDEO GAMING APPARATUS FOR WAGERING WITH

UNIVERSAL COMPUTERIZED CONTROLLER AND I/O INTERFACE FOR UNIQUE ARCHITECTURE

Docket No.: 307.026US1 PA0368.ap.US

Examiner: S. Ashburn

Group Art Unit: 3713

provide evidence that the invention is enabled to one of ordinary skill in the art. Applicant has met the initial burden of enablement under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph. The PTO has not provided sound reasoning as to why any specific element of the claimed invention has not been enabled. The Applicant has provided sound reasoning why the subject matter of claim 18 has been enabled. It is clear that this rejection must be withdrawn.

The I/O connector pin attachment is therefore merely a communicatively coupled replication of the pin system and is readily understood and readily enabled to one of ordinary skill in the art.

Again, Applicant points out that to appreciate how easily the present invention may be practiced, **once the conception of the invention has been made**, as was originally done by Applicant, the underlying invention will be described with reference to the specification.

When new games have been developed within the gaming industry, it has been necessary to develop a customized peripheral interface to support the game (Page 6, lines 25-27). The universal game controller of the present invention is a standard PC-type unit that provides all game functions necessary to **implement** a wide variety of games by loading various program code on the universal controller and then separately providing unique game information (e.g., from a separate gaming application-specific kernel) (see page 8, line 19 through page 9, line 4 of the specification). What is intended to be included in the term game functions includes button controls, coin acceptors, touch screen coordinates, credit managers, currency acceptors, operating system, security devices, game operating code and the like (Page 11, lines 14-22; page 15, line 23 through page 16, line 7). Additional game functions could be a store of images (e.g., cards or roulette wheel/symbols; see page 20, lines 1-4). These are separately provided with the I/O system as pinning-hardware/software in the PC-type system with a motherboard (Page 12, line 18, through page 19, line 8). The harness is fitted to the unique structure of the gaming device and the motherboard is connected to or integral with the harness/pin system (page 13, lines 5-8).

This type of system is quite distinct from conventional implementation of casino gaming systems where the entire system and program is originally installed with both game peripherals and game rules on the same board, so that replacement of a game in a given machines requires

AMENDMENT AND RESPONSE

Applicant: Mark L. Yoseloff

Serial No.: 09/405,921

Filed September 24, 1999

Title: VIDEO GAMING APPARATUS FOR WAGERING WITH

UNIVERSAL COMPUTERIZED CONTROLLER AND I/O INTERFACE FOR UNIQUE ARCHITECTURE

Docket No.: 307,026US1 PA0368.ap.US

Examiner: S. Ashburn

Group Art Unit: 3713

the complete replacement of both peripheral controls. The game rules also must be uniquely and completely reconstructed and replaced. In the system claimed in the enabled practice of the invention, the invention provides a distinct set of a) pinning connections and game peripherals and b) game rules/controls. Once these distinct sets are provided, the old game rules from the original video gaming system may be connected through the new pinning/peripheral system or a new set of games rules using the inventively provided pinning system/game peripherals previously installed. In this manner, game designers may need to develop only the rules of the game, and the system peripherals are already available in the apparatus. This dramatically reduces game development time. (e.g., page 15, lines 2-7)

It must be pointed out at this time that the actual implementation of the invention uses known equipment, known software, known hardware, and known connectors. It is the design and distinct separation of functions that comprises the inventive step of the presently claimed invention. As the concept of providing the claimed configuration is clearly described in the specification, and as all of the component parts are within the conventional skill of the artisan to manufacture, the specification is *prima facie* enabling.

Applicants are preparing drawings to correct the asserted deficiencies raised under 37 C.F.R. 1.81(b) without the introduction of any new matter. These draft figures will be presented shortly after the filing of this amendment.

As Applicant has stated above, the individual components used in the practice of the present invention (without their content, with respect to the separate compilation of game peripherals) are components that can be described with enabling specificity by general terms known to those skilled in the art. The use of only general terms such as ports, computers, I/O interfaces, and the like, does not render the claims indefinite, and certainly does not require any experimentation in the association of the components in the manner specifically recited in the claims. Anyone of ordinary skill in the art would be able to assemble the general components in the manner recited, with their claimed content, without any undue experimentation. Based on the teachings of the specification, the assembly of the components would be within the most routine skills of the ordinarily skilled electronic or programming engineer in the video gaming art. The fact that general components are described in a different arrangement of elements

AMENDMENT AND RESPONSE

Applicant: Mark L. Yoseloff.

Serial No.: 09/405,921

Filed September 24, 1999

Title: VIDEO GAMING APPARATUS FOR WAGERING WITH

UNIVERSAL COMPUTERIZED CONTROLLER AND I/O INTERFACE FOR UNIQUE ARCHITECTURE

Docket No.: 307.026US1 PA0368.ap.US

Examiner: S. Ashburn

Group Art Unit: 3713

reduces the level of teaching that must be provided in the specification because the skill needed to connect those known general elements is clearly within the most routine skills of the artisan in the video gaming technologies field. This objection is clearly in error and must be withdrawn.

Applicant questions whether the rejection even meets minimum legal requirements (e.g., see *In re Strahilevitz*, Fed. Cir. 1982, 212 U.S.P.Q. 561) for establishing a *prima facie* case of failing to meet the requirements of 35 U.S.C. 112, first or second paragraphs. Without pointing out specific connections or component content that one of ordinary skill in the art would not be able to provide or perform, the rejection is merely an assertion of a legal conclusion without evidence or sound scientific reasoning that would support such an accusation. If the Examiner feels there is some specific failing in the enablement of the specification, the basis for that opinion must be specifically supported by evidence on the record. This has not been done, and therefore the rejection is inadequate as a matter of law. *In re Strahilevitz*, specifically requires that:

“A threshold issue is whether the PTO met its burden of proof in calling into question the enablement of appellant’s disclosure. This burden required that the PTO advance acceptable reasoning inconsistent with enablement.”

The rejection of record has failed to meet even this threshold burden of proof. The mere allegation of lack of enablement because of the use of general descriptive terms fails to establish a *prima facie* case on this issue. The fact that Applicant has established that every element in the combination is generically known as a component for video gaming equipment, that the ordinarily skilled artisan is capable of designing each element with the appropriate informational content, that the individual components of information content are known in the art, and that the connection an interaction of these components is within the skill of the artisan, Applicant has *prima facie* established enablement and the burden on the PTO for overcoming that established enablement requires sound reasoning and facts, not the mere allegation of a legal conclusion without supporting evidence.

AMENDMENT AND RESPONSE

Applicant: Mark L. Yoseloff

Serial No.: 09/405,921

Filed September 24, 1999

Title: VIDEO GAMING APPARATUS FOR WAGERING WITH

UNIVERSAL COMPUTERIZED CONTROLLER AND I/O INTERFACE FOR UNIQUE ARCHITECTURE

Docket No.: 307.026US1 PA0368.ap.US

Examiner: S. Ashburn

Group Art Unit: 3713

---

**RESPONSE TO THE REJECTIONS**

**Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. 112**

Claim 18 was rejected as not being enabled by the specification and as not being shown by a best mode of practicing the invention. As noted above, these rejections are legally insufficient as a matter of law.

Even though the request to differentiate the claimed subject matter from the prior art (stated in this rejection) is more appropriate to issues under 35 U.S.C. 103 and 35 U.S.C. 103(a), Applicant will emphasize and explain at least some of the specific differences recited in claim 18:

An interface adapter configured to operatively couple an interface assembly to a communication port operatively coupled to a **computerized video wagering game controller comprising nonvolatile storage with instructions stored thereon, the instructions when executed operable to cause the computer to execute a video wagering game controlled via the user interface assembly.**

Applicant asserts that the prior art does not show the totality of the highlighted portions of the claim. The use of game controls (by the peripherals in the interface/controller assembly) executed by the computer (which is distinct from the interface/controller assembly) is novel and unobvious. Even the general terms used clearly distinguish from the prior art.

The basis of the rejection appears to be an implication that the claims are "too broad" even though they have not been shown to read on the prior art. Applicant believes that the generic invention and pioneering invention described in the claims is entitled to sufficiently broad coverage to protect the true scope of the invention. Additionally, rejecting claims as being too broad, without providing specific reasons why specific aspects of the invention have not been enabled has consistently been refused by the Courts.

**The Rejection of Claims 1-26 Under 35 U.S.C. 103(a)**

AMENDMENT AND RESPONSE

Applicant: Mark L. Yoseloff

Serial No.: 09/405,921

Filed September 24, 1999

Title: VIDEO GAMING APPARATUS FOR WAGERING WITH

UNIVERSAL COMPUTERIZED CONTROLLER AND I/O INTERFACE FOR UNIQUE ARCHITECTURE

Docket No.: 307.026US1 PA0368.ap.US

Examiner: S. Ashburn

Group Art Unit: 3713

Claims 1-26 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as unpatentable over Acres (U.S. Patent No. 5,752,882) in view of Arcade Machine Retrofit (10/20/1996, [www.cygnus.uwa.edu.au/jaycole/jaw/arcade.html](http://www.cygnus.uwa.edu.au/jaycole/jaw/arcade.html), hereinafter referred to as "Arcade").

The rejection asserts that Acres shows:

- 1) controlling a variety of gaming devices produced by different manufacturers through a common interface unit;
- 2) linking gaming machines to a common controller; and
- 3) employing PCs as central controllers.

It is then asserted that Arcade shows retrofitting of video arcade games. It was then asserted that it was obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to retrofit the apparatus of Acres as described by Arcade, therefore rendering the invention obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art.

It is first to be noted that the art cited against the present invention is not relevant to the actual field of the invention. The present invention as claimed and as originally claimed recites computerized wagering game apparatus, while the reference art used in the rejection is uniformly directed towards arcade games. This is non-analogous art and does not form a good basis for even beginning an analysis of the present invention. Additionally, there is substantial information recited in the claims that also clearly differentiates the invention and the field of the invention from the prior art. Among such limitations are (from claim 1):

- a) computerized wagering game status information and
- b) symbol elements that change with the play of the wagering game.

There is absolutely no disclosure in either of the references used in the rejection with regard to these types of limitations in the claims. The rejection is fatally deficient with respect to providing disclosure of underlying limitations and elements of the claimed invention.

The rejection fails to appreciate the underlying concept of the invention recited in the claims. This failure will be analyzed with respect to claim 1, with that claim reproduced below, and salient deficiencies in the prior art used in the rejection highlighted in the claim:

A computerized wagering game apparatus, comprising:

a computerized game controller operable to control a computerized wagering game;  
a video display device providing a visual representation of a signal provided by the



AMENDMENT AND RESPONSE

Applicant: Mark L. Yoseloff

Serial No.: 09/405,921

Filed September 24, 1999

Title: VIDEO GAMING APPARATUS FOR WAGERING WITH

UNIVERSAL COMPUTERIZED CONTROLLER AND I/O INTERFACE FOR UNIQUE ARCHITECTURE

Docket No.: 307.026US1 PA0368.ap.US

Examiner: S. Ashburn

Group Art Unit: 3713

computerized game controller such that the video display device displays at least one visual image selected from the group consisting of

c) computerized wagering game status information and

d) symbol elements that change with the play of the wagering game;

a communication port communicatively coupled to the computerized game controller;

a interface assembly comprising one or more user interface devices; and

an I/O interface configured to communicatively couple the interface assembly to the communication port.

Each of these features in wagering apparatus is absent from the disclosure of the references cited in the rejection. Additionally, the concept of executing peripheral controls in the universal controller from a separate computer has not been disclosed in the art cited in the rejection.

Additionally, the recited element of the "interface assembly comprising one or more user interface devices" is not shown in the art. Even though the gaming apparatus of Acres has user interface devices, these are not located within an interface assembly, but is supported on the computer motherboard. This is consistent with the background of the prior art. Neither reference nor the combination of references even hints at this type of modification of the prior art video wagering gaming apparatus.

Acres controls local computers (\*for example, within a casino) from a central computer. The central computer sends signals to the local computers to adjust any functions that a human controller intends to adjust. This is in stark contrast to the use in the present invention of supplemental hardware, a physical device as opposed to a distal signal, to alter play activities. There is no obvious connection between the distal, computer-based control system of Acres and the locally implanted, hardware modifications recited in the practice of the present invention. Acres focuses on remote configuration (see column 6, lines 35 3-8) while the present invention recites only direct local control by addition of a device. There is almost no nexus between the teachings of Acres and the claimed invention. In fact, the majority of hardware discussed by Acres relative to the implementation of that invention is located outside the gaming apparatus.

AMENDMENT AND RESPONSE

Applicant: Mark L. Yoseloff.

Serial No.: 09/405,921

Filed September 24, 1999

Title: VIDEO GAMING APPARATUS FOR WAGERING WITH

UNIVERSAL COMPUTERIZED CONTROLLER AND I/O INTERFACE FOR UNIQUE ARCHITECTURE

Docket No.: 307.026US1 PA0368.ap.US

Examiner: S. Ashburn

Group Art Unit: 3713

Note for example, column 10, lines 17-43 for the discrete machine interface, which is located outside the gaming apparatus.

Additionally, the teachings in Arcade teach nothing reasonable to the practice of the present invention. A brief review of Arcade shows that it is a worthless reference with regard to the recited practice of the invention.

The first step taught by Arcade is "Rip out everything from the box!" (emphasis natural). The second step in Arcade is "Rewire the buttons." The third step is "Chop up a keyboard." The entire procedure and disclosure is to replace one existing play system with another complete play system. There is no concept of providing a universal peripheral wagering game system that can then be driven by replaceable wagering game rules provided as a distinct component.

Note the distinct difference of this process (the only retrofitting process cited in the art used in the rejection) and the process recited in claim 9:

"...a) removing an original special-purpose computerized game controller used to control a computerized wagering game from the apparatus, the original computerized game controller designed to and capable of working exclusively with a particular computerized wagering game apparatus;

b) inserting a universal computerized game controller operable to control a video wagering game that can be played on the video wagering game apparatus and an I/O interface that operatively couples the universal computerized game controller to user interface devices of the wagering game apparatus;..."

Rather than ripping out the entire box (the quote from Arcade), the game controller is removed, and the wagering game elements remain in the system and are then driven by the inserted universal game device. These steps are not shown by Acres in view of Arcade.

Claim 10 similarly requires that the "...display device displays at least one visual image selected from the group consisting of a) computerized wagering game status information and b) symbol elements that change with the play of the wagering game." This is not shown by either reference or the combination of references.

AMENDMENT AND RESPONSE

Applicant: Mark L. Yoseloff

Serial No.: 09/405,921

Filed September 24, 1999

Title: VIDEO GAMING APPARATUS FOR WAGERING WITH

UNIVERSAL COMPUTERIZED CONTROLLER AND I/O INTERFACE FOR UNIQUE ARCHITECTURE

Docket No.: 307.026US1 PA0368.ap.US

Examiner: S. Ashburn

Group Art Unit: 3713

Claim 18 requires a combination of specific elements that are not suggested by the combination of Acres in view of Arcade. Specifically claim 18 recites:

18. An interface adapter configured to operatively couple an interface assembly to a communication port operatively coupled to a computerized video wagering game controller comprising nonvolatile storage with instructions stored thereon, the instructions when executed operable to cause the computer to execute a video wagering game controlled via the user interface assembly.

The highlighted limitations are clear recitations of elements and their function in the practice of the invention. This combination of elements and their functions are not shown in the combination of Acres in view of Arcade, which has been used to reject the claims. In particular, there is no interface adapter operatively coupling an interface assembly to a communication port coupled to a computerized video wagering game controller comprising volatile storage with instructions stored therein. These highlighted features and functions are clearly absent from the combination of references used in the rejection. Claims 22-25 further recite an aspect of the invention emphasizing these points and also clearly distinguish from the two references cited in the rejection.

**RESPONSE TO THE COMMENTS OF THE EXAMINER**

The essence of the comments provided by the Examiner in paragraph 6 on page 5 of the Final Office Action mailed on April 20, 2001 is to the effect that "It is common necessity to upgrade obsolete processors for faster, more capable system" and this is, in effect, all that the present invention claims. It is this preconception of what is being performed in the present invention that forms the erroneous basis for the rejection.

The present invention is not merely an upgrade in processor capability. It is a complete reconfiguring of the architecture to enable ready design and implementation of games on the supporting new architecture. There is no other system available, in arcade games or video wagering games that provides underlying intelligence that can be used in the design and play of multiple games. In video arcade games, each game has its complete software system. Different games are played by complete replacement of the game card and game chips. There is no

AMENDMENT AND RESPONSE

Applicant: Mark L. Yoseloff

Serial No.: 09/405,921

Filed September 24, 1999

Title: VIDEO GAMING APPARATUS FOR WAGERING WITH

UNIVERSAL COMPUTERIZED CONTROLLER AND I/O INTERFACE FOR UNIQUE ARCHITECTURE

Docket No.: 307.026US1 PA0368.ap.US

Examiner: S. Ashburn

Group Art Unit: 3713

immortal component with intelligence that can be used in multiple games. There are no fundamental game properties (e.g., image graphics) that can be carried from game to game, without the need to design new imagery for each new game.

By practice of the present invention, imagery of cards is maintained in the apparatus and the imagery is executed by the game controller. This is recited within the claim language (e.g., claim 18) of:

“...a computerized video wagering game controller comprising nonvolatile storage with instructions stored thereon, the instructions when executed operable to cause the computer to execute a video wagering game controlled via the user interface assembly.

This is a system that is fundamentally antagonistic to the underlying design of video arcade games and personal arcade games.

**CONCLUSION**

All rejections have been shown to be in error. All rejections should be withdrawn and all claims allowed.

Respectfully submitted,

Mark L. Yoseloff  
By his Representatives,  
MARK A. LITMAN & ASSOCIATES, P.A.  
YORK BUSINESS CENTER, SUITE 205  
3209 West 76<sup>th</sup> Street  
Edina, MN 55435  
(952) 832.9090

Date *20 June 2001*

By

*Mark A. Litman*  
Mark A. Litman

Reg. No. 26,390

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as first class mail in an envelope addressed to Assistant Commissioner of Patents, Washington, D.C. 20231 on *June 20, 2001*.

Name Mark A. Litman

Signature *Mark A. Litman*